

Remarks

In the Final Office Action mailed on 10 January 2008, the Examiner rejected all claims (1-25) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over McIntyre (United States Patent Number 6,690,478) in view of Wood (United States Patent Publication Number 2004/0243934) and further in view of Motamed (United States Patent Number 6,559,958).

Applicants traverse the rejection but in hopes of advancing prosecution of this application have amended various claims to more clearly distinguish over the cited art. Applicants may later pursue broader protection in a continuing application claiming priority to this earlier application.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected all claims (1-25) under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over McIntyre in view of Wood and Motamed. Applicants traverse the rejection.

However, in hopes of advancing prosecution of this patent application, various claims have been amended to clarify distinctions over the art of record. In particular, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 to include additional limitation wherein the work units are of 4 types - data work units, scheduled control work units, immediate control work units, and interrupt control work units. Data work units contain data to be transformed by the various compute nodes to which the data work units are dispatch through a queue. Control units all include commands directing operation of the compute nodes. Scheduled control work units are placed at the end (tail) of the queue to be processed in order after all presently queued data (and other control) work units. Immediate control work units are queued at the start (head) of the queue to be processed next by a compute node before any other work units in the queue. Interrupt control work units are transferred directly the affected compute node(s), bypassing the queue completely, to be processed immediately by any affected compute node(s). Support for these features is found at page 6 of the specification of the subject application starting at line 3 through page 10, line 7.

Nothing in the art of record, considered individually or in any combination teaches or remotely suggests such a structure by which processing of data work units to

be transformed and processing of various types of control work units are interspersed through the use of the queue and by bypassing the queue. Thus Applicants maintain that amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 are allowable over all art of record, considered individually or in any combination.

Dependent claims 5-8, 14-17, and 22-24 have been cancelled with their respective recitation subsumed by the amended limitations of their respective base, independent claims. Various claims have been amended for editorial clarity by removing the labels for steps (e.g., "a)", "b)", etc.).

In view of the above discussion and the various amendments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection.

Conclusion

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 to overcome the Examiner's rejection. Applicants have various claims and amended others for editorial clarity. Applicants have traversed and thoroughly discussed the Examiner's rejection of all claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection.

Applicant believes that no other fees are due in this matter. Should any issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel N. Fishman/

Daniel N. Fishman #35,512
Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 786-7687
(303) 786-7691 (fax)